

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1–20 were pending and were rejected. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 11, and 16 are amended. Claim 6 is cancelled. Claims 1–5 and 6–20 remain pending. Reconsideration is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### ***Examiner's Response to Arguments Previously Presented***

Examiner's comments with regard to his interpretation of claim 1 are noted and appreciated. Although Applicant believes the claims previously presented were consistent with the arguments previously made, Applicant has amended claim 1 as suggested by Examiner. Claim 7 has been correspondingly amended. It is believed that these amendments provide no change in the scope of the claim and thus these amendments should not give rise to any prosecution history estoppel.

### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101***

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as drawn to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 6 has been cancelled, obviating this rejection.

### ***Prior Art Rejections***

Claims 1–5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,260,783 to Dixit ("Dixit"). Claims 11–13 and 16–19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent 6,333,948 to Kurobe et al. ("Kurobe") in view of Dixit. Claims 6–10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Dixit in view of Kurobe. Claims 14, 15, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Kurobe in view of Dixit and the H.264 recommendation. These rejections are respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth below.

Each independent claim requires, among other things, "generating a map indicating what macroblocks were assigned to the first slice group, the map comprising a list of numbers, one for each coded macroblock, specifying the slice group to which each coded macroblock belongs." The quoted language is from claim 1, though similar language is included in each independent claim. Examiner relies on Dixit as teaching the "map" limitation of each claim. Specifically, Examiner relies on the "vertical strip-location subfield" taught at col. 11, ll. 47–50 of Dixit.

However, Dixit does not teach that this “vertical strip-location subfield” comprises “a list of numbers, one for each coded macroblock, specifying the slice group to which each coded macroblock belongs.”

At most, Dixit teaches that a strip, *i.e.*, a group of contiguous macroblocks extending across the entire picture, can be intra refreshed in a given frame. This strip is identified in the header of the packets carrying the frame. Thus, only a single number corresponding to this strip is transmitted, and not a list of numbers, one for each coded macroblock, specifying the slice group to which each coded macroblock belongs. This distinction is important, as the map recited in the independent claims permits blocks having no particular spatial relationship to be intra refreshed. Conversely, Dixit is limited to refreshing only a particular strip as an all-or-nothing proposition. Incidentally, it is not clear that Dixit’s strip of macroblocks to be refreshed is a “slice” as that term is used in the present application and would be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. As used herein, “slice” is a term of art referring to a processing unit in certain video processing standards.

In any case, neither Kurobe nor the other art of record teaches this limitation missing from Dixit. As Examiner correctly notes, Kurobe does not teach or suggest a map that is transmitted at all. In fact, Kurobe does not appear to determine which macroblocks are to be intra refreshed using a deterministic mechanism but rather based on the motion content of the blocks. In any case, Kurobe certainly does not teach or suggest generating and transmitting a map that comprises “a list of numbers, one for each coded macroblock, specifying the slice group to which each coded macroblock belongs.”

Because the cited art fails to teach or suggest each limitation of the pending independent claims, and because the pending dependent claims also include this limitation, the rejections of all pending claims are improper. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of all outstanding rejections and a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims is requested.

\*\*\*\*\*

Respectfully submitted,

**August 6, 2008**

Date

**/Billy C. Allen III/**

Billy C. Allen III

Reg. No. 46,147

**WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH,**

**RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P.**

20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600

Houston, TX 77070

832/446-2400

832/446-2424 (facsimile)

wcpatent@counselip.com